

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on December 10, 2007. Claims 1, 4-13, 15-19 and 41 were pending in that action. The Applicants respectfully point out that claim 14 was canceled in Applicants' previous amendment. The Examiner rejected all claims. With this response, claim 15 is amended to correct a syntax error. The remaining claims are unchanged. Consideration and allowance of claims 1, 4-13, 15-19 and 41 are respectfully solicited in light of the following comments.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 9-10 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,678,866 issued to Sugimoto et al. (hereinafter "Sugimoto"). However, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 as previously presented is not anticipated by Sugimoto. Claim 1 recites the limitations of "receiving data at an interface indicating a desired text for the new label; searching a label database for indications of existing labels that include text matching the desired text, wherein existing labels represented in the label database are computer-implemented user interface elements; and returning to a user, based at least in part on the results of the search of the label database, a list of existing labels that include text matching the desired text". (emphasis added). While the Applicants' method is directed to creating a new label, "wherein the new label is a computer-implemented user interface element configured to identify a control within a user interface," the label having text, Sugimoto's label is an image: "By "label" is meant a display area on a computer display screen for displaying information. This term refers to an image that simulates an actual label or paper tag that can be displayed on to the desktop as though a piece of paper (tag) were affixed there." (column 2, lines 49-54; emphasis added). Thus, Sugimoto discloses neither a label as "an element configured to identify a control" nor a label comprising text, as claimed.

Moreover, independent claim 1 recites a limitation of searching "for indications of existing labels that include text matching the desired text." In contrast, the passage relied on by the Examiner to teach this limitation discloses a comparison of a sponsor identifier contained in the label information against the sponsor identifier stored in a registry (column 16, lines 21-28). There is no teaching in Sugimoto that such identifier information is text; such information could be in numerical or bar code form, for example. Thus, the text matching limitation of claim 1 is not disclosed by Sugimoto. Thus, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 4 and 9-10 are

not anticipated by Sugimoto. Moreover, at least some of the dependent claims separately recite additional limitations that are not taught by Sugimoto. For example, claim 10 recites the limitations of “receiving data at the interface indicating how the new label is to be used.” There is no disclosure in the cited sections of Sugimoto that an operator receiving data inputs in Sugimoto’s method receives any indication of how a new label is to be used, as recited in claim 10. The passage cited by the Examiner merely teaches that a computing environment may include an input device, without teaching any link between the input device and a label and without teaching any substance of the input.

Independent claim 41 recites that a label “is a computer-implemented user interface element configured to identify a control within a user interface associated with the business integration system.” As discussed earlier, Sugimoto’s labels are images, such as those to convey advertising information. Therefore, they do not meet the definition of a label as set forth in independent claim 41 for an element to identify a control. Moreover, claim 41 recites “receiving data at an interface indicating how the new label is to be used.” As discussed above with respect to claim 10, Sugimoto does not teach this limitation.

Because Sugimoto does not teach each element of claim 1, 4, 9-10 or 41, it does not anticipate these claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5-8 and 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugimoto in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0004946 A1 of VanDenAvond et al. (hereinafter “VanDenAvond”). Each of claims 5-8, 11-13 and 15-19 depends from independent claim 1. Claim 1 defines a label as “a computer-implemented user interface element configured to identify a control wherein a user interface associated with the business integration system.”

In sharp contrast, VanDenAvond’s label is a packaging label, such as a printed material for affixing onto a container. (paragraphs 2 and 3). For example, VanDenAvond’s labels are stickers that are applied to boxes to enable people to identify the contents of the boxes or enable people to identify the intended shipping destinations of the boxes. VanDenAvond’s labels are clearly not computer-implemented user interface elements configured to identify control within a user interface, as recited in claim 1. The physical sticker disclosures of VanDenAvond are in a completely unrelated field compared to the claimed labels. A person of ordinary skill in the art

would therefore not look to VanDenAvond to modify the teachings of Sugimoto. Therefore, the combination of VanDenAvond and Sugimoto is not a proper one on which to base an obviousness rejection. Moreover, even when VanDenAvond and Sugimoto are combined, they do not render obvious each claimed limitation. For example, the label of Sugimoto refers to an image used in advertising. The label in VanDenAvond refers to a sticker applied to a container. Even in combination, these references do not render obvious a recitation of a label as “a computer-implemented user interface element configured to identify a control within a user interface associated with the business integration system,” as claimed. Therefore, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 5-8, 11-13 and 15-19 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Sugimoto and VanDenAvond.

Moreover, at least some of the dependent claims individually recite additional limitations that are not rendered obvious by the combination of the references. For example, claim 18 recites “associating an ID of the selected label with the new label.” This is taught by Applicants’ specification at, for example, page 7, lines 11-28:

“When the selected label is duplicated to the new label, a GUID is generated for the new label, and an entry in the new label’s record is generated indicating the GUID of the label that was duplicated to this label. This entry is provided to allow the text of the new label to be updated when the parent label’s text is changed. Further, when a label is duplicated to the new label any associated translations are copied to the label text table for the new label. This allows for the full language capability of the business solution software system to carry over to the new label without incurring any additional costs associated with translating the new label into the available languages. In another embodiment, when a translated version of the label is updated, all related labels sharing the same master label are updated with the new version of the translated label.”

No such association of identifying information between a selected label and a new label is taught by either Sugimoto or VanDenAvond, alone or in combination. The passages of VanDenAvond relied upon by the Examiner teach that while existing label ID’s are searched, a new ID is associated with a new label. In contrast, claim 18 recites that an existing ID of a selected label is associated with a new label. In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of the claims 5-8 and 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).


In conclusion, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4-13, 15-19 and 41 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references considered independently or in combination.

Accordingly, allowance of all pending claims is respectfully solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 
Mai-Tram D. Lauer, Reg. No. 43,589
Suite 1400
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CLH:MDL:rkp